

REMARKS

In the **non-final** Office Action mailed September 29, 2009 the Office noted that claims 1-18 were pending and rejected claims 1-18. Claims 1-18 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, claims 19 and 20 have been added, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 1-20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lagosanto, U.S. Patent No. 6,807,561. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a microcircuit card comprising: **at least one data object associated to at least one first reference local to the card to locally address and execute the data object**; a register comprises a logical identifier of said object and **the** at least one first **local** reference ; and a means adapted, on reception of a first message **from a terminal, said message comprising** said logical identifier **of the data object**, to communicate **to the terminal** at least one second local reference obtained from said at least one first local reference." (Emphasis added) Support for the amendment may be found, for example, on page 2, line 12, page 7, line 28 and page 9, lines 2-19 of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new

matter is believed to have been added by the amendment of claim 1. Claim 10 has been amended in a similar manner.

Lagosanto discusses a method for communicating messages between a client application within a terminal and an application within a smart card. This method implements a proxy in the terminal and a corresponding skeleton in the smart card, to operate corresponding translations between method calls and APDU messages. As discusses in Lagosanto, the method calls are known from both applications (in the terminal and in the smart card) and a translation of these calls is performed to comply with APDU communication protocol between the terminal and the smart card.

In this respect, the method calls are used locally (within the smart card) to address and execute any data object (e.g. Java object) and also known from the client application of the terminal since the method are published (Lagosanto col. 6, line 35).

In use, the APDU messages corresponding to specific method calls only enables obtaining the response of said method.

In contrast, the claimed invention states that the smart card communicates a second local reference based on the first one, upon requesting message from the terminal. This enables the terminal to have knowledge of unpublished methods for better addressing through instructions.

In Lagosanto, the method calls and the corresponding APDU messages are known from the creation of the applications and

proxy/skeleton (col. 2, lines 27-42), the translation being a mapping (col. 6, line 15). Since the methods are published and known (col. 6, line 35), there is no need to exchange messages between the terminal and the smart card in order to know a local reference from a logical reference.

As a consequence, Lagosanto fails to recite "a means adapted, on reception of a first message from a terminal, said message comprising said logical identifier of the data object, to communicate to the terminal at least one second local reference obtained from said at least one first local reference," as in amended claim 1.

In this respect, it may be noted that the APDU messages of Lagosanto cannot be considered as the claimed first local reference, since they do not "locally address and execute the data object," as in amended claim 1 and require translation by the skeleton into a method call.

Claim 10 recites similar features. For at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1 and 10 and the claims dependent therefrom are not anticipated by Lagosanto.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 19 and 20 are new. Support for claims 19 and 20 may be found, for example, on page 3, lines 8-16 of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new matter is believed to have been added by the addition of the claims. The

Applicants submit that the prior art of records fails to disclose the first message comprises the logical identifier of the data object is an APDU message; or the means for obtaining are configured to obtain the second local reference using APDU messages exchanged with the card.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102. It is also submitted that claims 1-20 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/jr